

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-15 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

jennifer patin
p : pcx 333
b110x1 MS 39533-0333



September 22, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NGL File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

jennifer patin

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Shawn Mack
Mack
SMC
206 Central Skokie Rd
Lake Bluff, IL 60044-1735



September 21, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Shawn Mack
Mack
SMC

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket #6-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Joe Conrath
cc:
simkrist@tiadon.com
403 gulf
Lamar, MO 64759-1290



September 21, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Joe Conrath
cc:
simkrist@tiadon.com

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Jason Green
2906 Messer Road
Widewater, NC 28690-9558

September 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Jason Green



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Matthew Bartkewicz
320 Main St.
Box Monmouth, NJ 07758-1041

September 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NRC File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Matthew Bartkewicz



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Charles Thorne
1028 Stockslager Rd
Oakland, MD 21550-7645

September 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Charles Thorne

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Douglas Derstine
2504 creekside dr
Lansdale, PA 19446-7405



September 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Doug Derstine

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information.
Message text follows:

Kevin Brown
321 S. Spring Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104-3629



September 18, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD file No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Kevin Brown

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket #6-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Tania Smith
132 Carolina Lake Drive #306
Daytona Beach, FL 32114-7473



September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Brian Smith

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
and Information
Message text follows:

Ned Humphrey
Managing Editor
878 Saint Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202-2406



September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
N3D File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Ned Humphrey
Managing Editor

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Kyle Chambers
3 Cliffe Hill Cr.
Potomac, MD 20854-2945

September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pair of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Kyle Chambers

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows

Catherine Prah
1201 Connecticut Ave NW #250
Washington, DC 20036-2635



September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Catherine Prah

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Judy Steckel
IT Specialist
9433 Gentle Circle
Montgomery Village, MD 20886-1208



September 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No L-00-12.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Judy Steckel
IT Specialist

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

J A Coasar
6117 Surrey Square Lane
District Heights, MD 20747-2995



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

On Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NAB file No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

J A Coasar

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
*CC Information
Message text follows



May 34
554 Burnside Drive Apt 1
Rockville, MD 20853-2461

September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

Re: Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NAB File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

May Yow

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Lynn Pomponi
1607 Brisbane St
Silver Spring, MD 20902-3903

September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Lynn Pomponi

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows

Angela Douglas
11702 Kimberly Woods Lane
Ft. Washington, MD 20744-5919

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

SEP 10 6 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NBC File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Angela Douglas

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Perry B. Thomas
President
1102 Barnaby Terrace, SE
Washington, DC 20032-4301



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NBD File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Perry B. Thomas, PhD, LNHA
President

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Trameece Jeffries
400 Ford Street SE
Washington, DC 20020-1947



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

On Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSF File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Trameece Jeffries

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Archiever Fraser
3450 Toledo Terrace, #625
Hyattsville, MD 20782-1336



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NAB File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Archiever L. Fraser

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
F 2 Information
Message text follows:

Gary Flinchum
10813 Weeping Willow Lane
Bel Airville, MD 20705-3824



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USE was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Gary Flinchum

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Tom VanderStaaay
338 Meander Dr.
Bullhead City, AZ 86442-4741



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD file No L-00-12.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Tom VanderStaaay

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows.

Diane Atkinson
1117 Southview Drive #101
Oxon Hill, MD 20745-3422



September 10 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Diane Atkinson

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
ECF Information
Message text follows:



CHI MARASIGAN
2734 SO TROY ST
ARLINGTON, VA 22206-2913

September 10, 2001

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSL File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

CHI MARASIGAN

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Troy Ardinger
083/0427307-
52 Keystone Ave.
Chambersburg, PA 17201-3376

September 29, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
N3L File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Troy Ardinger
083/04273075

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
F C Information
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Message text follows.

Ajit Viswambharan
Infrastructure Engineer
2709 Livingstone Lane
Vienna, VA 22180-7260



September 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
N3D File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 per month for all wireless phones will greatly increase the cost of cell phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford my wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Ajit Viswambharan
Infrastructure Engineer

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows.

Jennifer Nordheimer
7001 Carmichael Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20817-4611



September 29, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Jennifer Nordheimer